

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 37, NO. 20

April 24, 1944

WHOLE NO. 996

IN THE CLASSROOM

A Cicero Course (*Brown*); Progressus a Non Progrediendo (*Hahn*);
High-School Latin (*Withers*); The Teacher's Approach to the Pro-
fession, The Teacher's Approach to the Course, The Teacher's Ap-
proach to the Student (*Krauss*); More Against Overworking Trans-
lation (*Linforth*)

Custom-Built Textbooks and Laboratory Manuals

Editions of 100-2500 copies are practical in Lithoprint form.

Halftones and Line Drawings reproduced without special electros
Language texts Lithoprinted in Typewriter Type
Rush service on temporary texts for Army and Navy courses

UNIVERSITY LITHOPRINTERS

Ypsilanti, Michigan

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Franklin B. Krauss, Secretary and Treasurer, Pennsylvania State College; Box 339, State College, Penna.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Jotham Johnson, Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plümpe, Bluma L. Trell.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, or the District of Columbia, a subscription to CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to The Classical Journal) is included in the membership fee of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, whose members are also entitled to The Classical Outlook and The Classical Journal at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary-Treasurer.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 37 contains issues dated: October 4, 11, 18, 25; November 1, 15, 29; December 6, 13 (1943); January 3, 10, 17; February 7, 14; March 6, 13, 20, 27; April 17, 24; May 1, 8, 15, 22; June 5 (1944).

MEMORANDA

The war has caused neither damage nor inactivity at the American Academy in Rome. Professor A. W. Van Buren, the resident director, is quoted in a news dispatch on the safety of the institution and its properties. He mentions specifically that there has been no loss by theft. For this he expressed gratitude both to the Italian government, which has permitted no damage at British, French or American art institutions, and to the Swiss Legation for its protection.

After the first few days of Italy's participation in the war against the United States, Professor Van Buren and his assistants were entirely unmolested. They took

advantage of what The New York Times calls "the quiet time" to advance the cataloguing of the Academy library which had been interrupted. Unless the reporter is slyly suggesting that American students were noisier and more disturbing, it is hard to imagine the quietude, since Professor Van Buren has been within the range of the sound of artillery at Anzio, and certainly not far from the objectives of recent bombings in the vicinity of Rome. All American students of art and antiquity will feel a debt to Professor Van Buren for his faithful stewardship, and we wish that the past eighteen months could have been as idyllic for him as the cited interview would make them seem.

IN THE CLASSROOM

A Cicero Course

For many Americans the residuum of the Cicero course is the impression that Cicero's chief claim to fame was his successful prosecution of Catiline. To me such an impression is the dull and tragic betrayal of a splendid heritage.

My profession is that of teaching boys and girls and incidentally teaching them Latin. Whatever course I might teach, I should still be anxious that my students should not only *know* something more, but also *be* something more important after a year's work.

Applying this line of thought to my Cicero course I extricated myself from the smoke and mud of the old favorites like the orations *In Catilinam* and *In Verrem* and Sallust's *Vita Catilinae*, especially after it occurred to me that one might paraphrase the first of these with little loss of content thus: "You scoundrel, Catiline, scam! And he did, by Jove, with my help; we've caught him red-handed and his friends with him; now let's beat them up." Trying to teach courage and self-control and kindness and human dignity from that kind of reading is like trying to vault a fence but always insisting that you must take off from an adjacent cellar. I have not observed that parents succeed in

teaching good manners by offering themselves as horrible examples. The world is full enough of hatred and violence and treachery, and our students see these human elements only too clearly. Let us like Dante "issue out, again to see the stars"; let us see that our students have every opportunity to become strong, intelligent, courageous citizens in a society whose shape and spirit we can only guess, and likewise prepare them for an immediate future which almost certainly will bring the need for spiritual stamina.

Our stability is but balance, and conduct lies in the masterful administration of the unforeseen.

Cicero has commanded men's affections through generations not because he was an orator but because he was a man of action who could also assay man's behavior and his relations with other men and with the gods. Think on the opportunity for guiding boys and girls to greater maturity through the medium of Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*, *De Amicitia*, *De Senectute*, *De Finibus*, *De Officiis*, *De Republica*, his *Brutus* and other essays. These have indeed "charmed magic casements." How much food for growth lies in serious discussion of one of Cicero's renderings from the *Apology*. Or turn to *De Republica*, which I have used with my students to their great enjoyment, "Neque

enim hac nos patria lege genuit aut educavit ut nulla quasi alimenta expectaret a nobis, ac tantum modo nostris ipsa commodis serviens, tutum perfugium otio nostro suppeditaret et tranquillum ad quietem locum; sed ut plurimas et maximas nostri animi, ingeni, consili partes ipsa sibi ad utilitatem suam pigneraretur, tantumque nobis in nostrum privatum usum, quantum ipsi superesse posset, remitteret." Dull would he be of soul who could not see here the chance for discussion which would make accurate comprehension of the text worth the effort. For here students find close contact with real life, not the "real" life of Verres and the Nazis, but a life in which students welcome further experience and guidance.

Students who take Cicero are fewer in number than they were some years ago, but they are of high calibre and interest. We must, therefore, give them more reading material that deserves their honest respect, material that will feed them and challenge them. Selections from the Essays are not beyond the intellectual grasp of these students; the grammar is not essentially different from that of the Orations, and only rarely are there sentences whose word-order seems hopelessly involved; the functional vocabulary of the Essays is to a large degree that of the College Board List without the terms of opprobrium so characteristic of that list. Selections from the Essays are available in one form or another, though there is a wide field here for cooperative effort among teachers. But even if such material were not readily available, it is essential that teachers of Cicero find for their classes reading material that will justify a year's work and will send students forth with an affectionate respect for a great Roman and some urge to "go and do likewise." To the plea that Latin teachers, loaded as they are with many additional responsibilities, cannot find time and energy to change the old course, I can only answer that we must do it or find our students assigned to more dynamic courses.

This is the plan of my own year's course: for the first six weeks we read from among the selections in opening of the book (Harrington and McDuffee, Third Year Latin, Ginn & Co.), ending with the portions of the Brutus given there, telling of Cicero's training as an orator; this leads to the reading of the Manilian Law; there follows a complete and thorough review of grammar in class with outside reading and outlined reports on topics of the students' own choosing; this is preparation for De Republica, from which I have made and mimeographed excerpts on the nature and difficulties of typical governments; next we read the Archias and end up the year with as many Letters as we have time to read.

The successful teacher of Cicero will also be his disciple, reading and rereading, only a little perhaps at any time but nevertheless consistently, the major works of "an eloquent man and a lover of his country." Let

us throw off the tyranny of standardized word lists and textbooks. Let us build our own to our own needs, remembering that if what our students read is of genuine spiritual value, they will be the readier to return to Cicero for help, will think of us and of Latin with affection, and we shall have fulfilled our duty as teachers in the development of self-confident, conscientious citizens.

"Quaeres a nobis, Gratti, cur tanto opere hoc homine delectemur." We might answer, as Cicero answered, "Because he gives us a fund of useful knowledge and strength to our souls" and we and our students know "illa quidem certe quae summa sunt ex quo fonte hauriamus."

THOMAS S. BROWN

WESTTOWN SCHOOL

Progressus a Non Progrediendo

It is interesting to observe the contrasting notions expressed on the teaching of Latin in the October 11 issue of CLASSICAL WEEKLY (37.2), and, to the present writer, stimulating to see that the general consensus is in favor of a return to the sound, solid methods of earlier days which many were scared away from by the decline in the popularity of Latin and by the Classical Investigation. The two phenomena just named have had a close interrelation. The existence of the former certainly impelled the institution of the latter; the latter was meant to check the former, but the fact that it has signally not succeeded in so doing might perhaps lead us to wonder whether a quite different campaign might not have had more effective results.

'Progressive' Education has had the field pretty much to itself for quite a while. It has a good name—one doesn't like to oppose anything called 'Progressive' just as one doesn't like to oppose anything called 'American' (such words as 'American,' 'Democracy,' and 'Freedom' have figured in the names of a number of organizations whose aims and methods have seemed to many of us quite to belie the meanings inherent in these terms). But the word 'Progressive' (along with the movement that it has been perhaps not too accurately used to describe) is now beginning to lose its potency. According to a report on the School Page of The New York Sun October 12, 1943, at a meeting of about 100 superintendents of schools in the metropolitan area which met—appropriately—in the stronghold of 'Progressive Education,' Teachers College, Columbia University, Dr. Alice Keliher, Professor of Education at New York University, "urged the superintendents to 'throw away the word "progressive" and talk about education for democracy.'" Why not next try just 'American Education' as a title?

The report goes on to say that according to Dr. Keliher, many parents are "confusedly contrasting 'good education' with 'progressive education.'" One assumes that this will not happen any longer when the

name is changed from 'progressive education' to 'education for democracy.' What's in a name indeed!

Dr. Keliher contended that progressive education has not defined its own objectives sufficiently clearly or explained them adequately to parents. Because of lack of information parents are mistakenly criticizing what they think are the failures of progressive education, she said.

Surely progressive education has had time enough to define, and to explain, and to bring forth results that will speak for themselves without definition or explanation. The progressive educationists have had the field pretty well to themselves since the first World War. The movement that started at Teachers College¹ has spread till now the vicious circle has completed its arc; Teachers College products are administrators everywhere, and now would-be teachers cannot gain positions under these administrators unless they have spent in more teachers' colleges, or in courses under their product in liberal arts colleges, the time that they should be giving to learning subject matter. We were horrified in World War I to find how many men were kept out of the armed forces by illiteracy. Now a generation later precisely the same condition exists in World War II; and into the bargain students admitted to high schools, and therefore presumably literate, have to have courses in something called 'Remedial Reading.' Perhaps if parents—and they are likely to be the ultimate arbiters—are turned against 'progressive education,' it is not merely for lack of definition and explanation.

Let us hope the pendulum may swing back. Maybe if the Progressive Educationists really give up the good word which they have claimed as their own but are now in alarm thinking of casting aside, some of the rest of us may take it back to ourselves and get some real progress accomplished. Already the new-fangled doctrines of the progressive school are beginning to sound a little passé. I learned in my History of Education courses at college about an appalling monitorial system—sponsored by Lancaster and Bell, if memory serves me aright (and I think it does, for I have a pretty good memory well-trained by old-fashioned educational methods)—by which, purely for reasons of economy, pupils were taught by fellow-pupils. Docilely and also quite sincerely, under our education teacher's direction we shuddered at such a ghastly makeshift. Somewhat like what Miss Wall seems to be advocating when she says (CW 37.21): "The class must be organized on a friendly, but informal basis, with carefully cultivated habits like those of a big committee listening to one another and working together, each one adding his share of ideas to the whole. Mistakes ought to be corrected by tactful questions from fellow-students who want to make a blunderer correct his error without saying bluntly to him, 'You are wrong here, or here.'" Isn't it just possible that the *teacher* is more competent than the pupils both to recognize these mistakes and

¹Bagley and Kandel dissenting.

to correct them by questions (tactful or otherwise)? Of course the good teacher will welcome and stimulate pupil participation in correcting mistakes as in every other phase of classroom activity, but the teacher and not the class is there to do the teaching; and I cannot deny that Miss Wall's picture of the class as "a big committee" seems to me to promise much less real progress than Mr. Downing's in the same issue (37.22), of the youngsters "like Ascanius trudging along behind his father, non passibus aequis" but "going in the right direction."

Mr. Downing, too, wants Latin to be 'attractive'; and so it will be, to any normal pupils, if conducted by a good teacher, such as I suspect Mr. Downing to be (for he "has loved Latin for many years" and "joyfully taught the language to the young"), under the methods that Mr. Downing advocates. But nothing that we cannot do with a reasonable degree of ease, understanding, and conscious power *can* be attractive to us. The student who is to be taught to *read* Latin (and I agree with Mr. Downing that if that is *not* our aim we should give up all pretense of teaching *Latin*, and go over to the social studies—beg pardon, social sciences—lock, stock, and barrel) must have a decent control of Latin morphology, syntax, and vocabulary. Otherwise he will flounder around miserably; in fact, he will fail (and we Latinists don't favor widespread failure any more than the progressives, only we believe in doing something to prevent it by other methods than that of advocating '100% promotion' for its own sake).

We *all* agree, I hope, with Miss Wall that "the use of words and different parts of words must always be the crucial point, not their names or rules for their use" (21). The employment of labels, to be sure, such as the names of cases or certain constructions, may be a very convenient time-saving device once it is certain that the things they stand for are clearly understood; but it assuredly isn't of cardinal importance. As for rules, it is noteworthy that Professor Sturtevant says (in the same issue, 17) that it is doubtful whether they are worth learning. But *he* is convinced that some things are worth learning—such as model sentences, and passages from Latin writers. And I happen to know that he is in complete accord with Mr. Seaman who (again in the same fruitful issue, 18) pleads for the reinstatement of the paradigm as something to be memorized and recited, as a matter of common sense and convenience. Personally, I am just a bit wary here, because I think the paradigm can be a master as well

²So, too, Mr. Gay, to whose admirable and noble theses I wholeheartedly subscribe—especially his view that the Latin teacher must be "thoroughly alive" and the Latin class both pleasant and worth while, and his insistence on constant professional and scholarly activity on the part of the teacher (23). If I am in general less specific in my references to Mr. Gay's article, fine though I think it, than to the others, it is simply because he has himself been less specific as to the precise means and methods that he would use to attain his ends.

as a servant; if a student has to run through the whole list of forms in the traditional order before he can locate the dative singular of a noun or the second plural of a verb, there is something wrong. However, I suppose that once the paradigm has been utterly mastered, the competent teacher can preclude such waste of time by drill enough to make either the recognition or the formulation of a given morphological unit instantaneous as it needs to be. At all events such recognition or formation surely is necessary, and cannot be guaranteed without adequate memorization. Hence I am completely in agreement with Mr. Downing when he speaks (22) of "young people, who should be at home learning declensions, conjugations and syntax"; and completely in disagreement with Miss Wall when she says (21), "Memory work must be reduced to a minimum, used only as a summing up and completing of some segment." Or at least I am completely in disagreement with her first eight words; I am not sure that I understand the remainder of her sentence.

And I am quite sure that I do *not* understand her when she says, "All the ideas rife today must be the light he sheds around the class, how all things grow (words, the alphabet, ideas)." "All the ideas rife today" would seem to be a pretty big order—also "how all things grow." As to how words, the alphabet, ideas grow—I think that I myself know something, though not nearly so much as I should like, about the first and the second, and I find both subjects much too complicated for me to be able to introduce them satisfactorily into the beginners' Latin class; and as for the third, I fear I must plead complete ignorance, but I feel that thought it *may* be a proper subject for a college class in psychology or in the history of ideas, it assuredly does not come within the scope of a high school class in foreign language. As to Miss Wall's final ideals, which I think can be summed up as mutual courtesy, cooperation, intelligent diligence, and general idealism, here I go along with her completely, for *these* are the features of any well-taught class; but as such they do not constitute the innovation—"a few changes in our thinking and an alteration in our class habits"—that she postulates at the beginning of her article as a means of convincing others "that we are a vitally important part of the new curriculum."

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

High-School Latin

Writing of high-school mathematics in *School and Society* (May 8, 1943), Glen Wakeham asserts that "it will not do high-school mathematics much good to increase the formal requirements for mathematics teachers," and adds: "Far more fundamental is the task of converting high-school authorities to a recognition of the cultural, as well as the technical, necessity of mathe-

matical training. This would be followed, of course, by the devotion of more curricular time to mathematics courses."

The same remarks apply with equal force to the teaching of Latin in the high schools. In this matter also there is no palpable advantage in elaboration of additional machinery, no justification for large faith in multiplied clubs, committees, and meetings. All the subject-matter branches, even the most favored, cleave to these procedures as to a sort of ritual, but the vast expense they entail in time and energy is not justified by returns.

The greatest need of Latin is appreciation of its benefits, and of the fundamentals of teaching it, on the part of school authorities, together with a permeating sense of responsibility, derived (if at all) from those same authorities, among the students.

Improvement will come with bettered conditions and environment of Latin instruction. These, in turn, can be guaranteed only if teachers of the modern languages, English included, can be persuaded of their personal liability in the case. It is more immediately important to accomplish that end even than to direct insistence at administrative authorities. The latter are, it is true, to be reached, but only through concerted effort of all the language teachers, equally affected as they are by the weakness or strength of Latin in their schools.

A. M. WITHERS

CONCORD COLLEGE

The Teacher's Approach to the Profession

As is true in all professions, some few individuals begin the active practice of their art with superior native talent improved by superior academic training. Likewise, some few bring to their task a distressingly low degree of ability and of training. The majority, however, are endowed in both respects with the capacity to perform their professional duties satisfactorily. Nevertheless, this condition should not remain static in the sense that the teacher will remain content with his past or present performance. A considerable, although often unobserved and unappreciated part of his professional life should be devoted to the self-assigned and systematic task of improving his knowledge and technique in his chosen field. This can be accomplished (1) by a growing acquaintance with those books that stand out as landmarks in his profession; (2) by examining new publications for new material or for diverse interpretations of old material; (3) by reading widely and wisely in allied fields; (4) by following new developments as these are reported and discussed in professional periodicals; (5) by attending professional meetings and thereby receiving stimulation through direct contact with fellow workers and the materials which they present; (6) by accepting mem-

bership in professional organizations, and by assuming duties that are incident to the activities of these organizations; and (7) by submitting articles to professional journals, and by reading papers to professional associations.

Through the faithful observance of these rules for the wholesome professional life, the teacher will avoid the Scylla and Charybdis of academic circles, namely, spiritual smugness and intellectual stagnation.

The Teacher's Approach to the Course

One of the basic principles of all education is that the subject matter in every field needs to be reedited periodically to acquire vital meaning for the generation to which it is addressed. The numerous text books that appear are collectively an attempt to satisfy this requirement. The majority of these, however, fail to achieve this desideratum, either because they adhere too strictly to traditional norms, both as to content and as to phrasing, or because they are excessively diluted with details that obscure rather than clarify the fundamental facts to be learned. The textbook which avoids these extremes and addresses itself simply, directly, and engagingly to the student for whom it is intended is, indeed, a rare product.

These faults characteristic of most textbooks are to be observed also in a great number of teachers. There are, on the one hand, those who purvey to students year in and year out the same material which they themselves were taught in corresponding courses. Then, there are those who seem to be overeager to divest themselves of much of their former training and to strike out in the direction of current educational fads. Both types are extremists equally culpable in that they fail or refuse to recognize their primary professional responsibilities, namely, to define in their own minds the essentials of their subject matter and to translate these into thought-provoking items of instruction for the student.

These responsibilities may be approached through the following considerations: (1) If the opportunity presents itself, the teacher should adopt for practical reasons a textbook that approximates the techniques, the arrangement of material, and the phraseology which he himself would prefer for classroom use. (2) In every instance the teacher should be thoroughly acquainted with the textbook *at the beginning of the course*. (3) The teacher should make a complete outline of the materials that he will use as the basis of the term's classroom recitations. (4) By reason of the integrated nature of textbooks, the teacher should not depart radically from the presentation of the material in a textbook, unless he has previously worked out in detail a substitute arrangement and is prepared to make this available to the student in clearly mimeographed form.

These provisions, if scrupulously observed, will give

the teacher a comprehensive view of the course, will enable him to realize what materials are of paramount importance, and thus will give to his daily instruction not only meaningful form and content but also definite purpose and direction.

The Teacher's Approach to the Student

Many teachers seem to think that their task begins and ends with the relatively one-sided business of assigning lessons, of asking the students to recite portions of these lessons, and of grading the quality of the answers. Yet, they should not overlook the fact that their own contributions to the content of the day's assignment are as much under the surveillance of the students as the student's recitation is subject to the teacher's criticism. Unless the teacher recognizes this fact and makes every effort to gain the confidence and good opinion of his students on the basis of his own presentation of the work, classroom hours are wasted in a monotonous round of rehearsing the material contained in the textbook. On the other hand, the student will be stimulated mentally if the teacher's remarks constitute a significant running commentary to the material under discussion. This desirable end may be attained if the teacher fulfills the following obligations: (1) The teacher should attempt to discover during the first few weeks of the course the level of intelligence and the degree of receptivity both of the individual student and of the class as a whole. (2) On the basis of these primary factors for learning, the teacher should plot tentatively the scope of the course, should regulate the size of the lessons, and should determine what essentials will most probably require special emphasis. In short, it is futile, as well as illogical, to attempt to teach the same materials in the same manner to successive classes, and thereby to ignore the fundamental pedagogical dictum that the course must be accommodated to the student rather than the student to the course. (3) The teacher should encourage each student in recitation work by addressing to him only those questions and problems that are within the range of his ability. This procedure not only develops confidence in the inferior pupils but also avoids the possibility of destroying the interest of such superior students as require, despite their talent, a considerable amount of time to gain a firm foothold in a new course. (4) Throughout the course the teacher should carefully note the progress, or lack of progress, of the individual student and of the entire class so as to keep the material continually within the reach of all pupils. It is not hereby suggested that the students rather than the teacher should consciously determine the scope and the pace of the course, but rather that the teacher should not adhere blindly to a predetermined plan and persist in following that plan irrespective of any change, whether good or bad, in the status of the class. Natur-

ally, the interest and enthusiasm of the students will be stifled in an atmosphere of boredom and discontent, unless the teacher cultivates in them the exhilarating feeling of achievement by leading them progressively to the solution of problems ever more challenging. On the other hand, the morale of the students will increasingly be infected by overpowering discouragement if they are justified in concluding that the teacher has set a goal which is beyond their ability and has prescribed a pace which they cannot possibly maintain. (5) The teacher should recognize that the term 'mastery' admits of several interpretations; mastery of individual and unrelated facts; mastery of a body of coordinated facts; mastery of all the component parts, individual and collective, of a complete system of thought. For all students, the first form of mastery is utterly specious. For the elementary and intermediate student, the second form constitutes the natural objective of learning and is indispensable to the third form. Only the advanced student of superior ability can acquire mastery in the third sense of the term.

It is a transgression against the subject and the student alike for the teacher through pedantry or indifference to require mastery in the first sense. Instruction that is confined to this useless objective resolves itself strictly into a mechanical test of memory. No less faulty is the attitude of the teacher who expects his students to display a scope of vision and a confident acquaintance with detail that are comparable to his own attainment in the subject. The teacher who insists on this type of mastery encourages his students to circumvent this unreasonable requirement by presenting materials other than those of their own creation.

Instead, the teacher should realize that he can anticipate at first only a comparative mastery of the essentials of the course. Accordingly, these essentials should be studied and discussed as early as possible, in order that the student may himself discover, much in the manner of a person learning to swim, what functions are necessary to any progress at all, and then by degrees learn to coordinate with these the functions that lend facility of movement, grace of style, and speed. Once the nature and interrelation of the functions are explained and demonstrated, it remains for the student to practice them under the watchful and sympathetic eye of the teacher. By this procedure the student is directed toward the mastery of a body of coordinated facts.

This fundamental method can succeed, however, only if the teacher couches his instruction in simple and direct terms. Too frequently, much of the student's time and energy goes to memorizing highly technical terminology and to attempts to associate it with the material under discussion. The proof of this observation is to be found in the fumbling and inadequate answers of students who try to recall and reproduce the dimly understood phraseology. Similarly, it has

amply been demonstrated that the capacity to absorb by dint of memory rules so phrased does not predicate the ability to apply them intelligently and correctly. No rule, however aptly expressed to suit the taste of the specialist, can be comprehended by the student until he has first learned to appreciate its function through terms that are meaningful to him.

The teacher should further simplify the mechanics of instruction by making himself familiar with the terminology that is current in courses in English grammar. By adopting such terms as enjoy almost universal usage and by employing these in his Latin classes, he will spare his students the burdensome and possibly confusing task of associating two sets of terms with the same concepts. Care must be exercised in this selection, however, since a term that is current in Latin grammars may more closely define a Latin concept than the corresponding English term may define the parallel English concept.

Despite all the foregoing considerations regarding the teacher's attitude and procedure, instruction will fall short of its best expression unless the teacher himself makes a personal contribution to the content of each day's work with a class. In order that this may be significant, the teacher will have to be thoroughly conversant with the assignment, with the features that present special problems to his students, and, with a concise and convincing commentary on each of these problems. Doubtless such exposition makes the heaviest demand on the resources, the ingenuity, and the intuition of the teacher, yet it alone lifts teaching from a science to an art, illumines the hidden and unsuspected corners of thought, and stimulates in the student confidence, respect, and emulation.

FRANKLIN B. KRAUSS

PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE

More Against Overworking Translation

In a recent communication to CLASSICAL WEEKLY, Dr. Raymond V. Schoder ("Against Overworking Translation" 37.5) has brought forward a matter of the first importance to teachers of Greek and Latin, and I wish to express my cordial agreement with his opinions, partly in the hope that by seconding them I may draw wider attention to them, partly to add a few observations on my own account. This I do in spite of a settled reluctance to meddle with the pedagogical methods of other teachers, because here we have to do with a thing that lies at the very heart of our business.

Translation is a slippery word. All will agree, I suppose, that it means an English version which presents all the thought of the original, no more and no less, in a style which produces something like the effect of the original. A translation in this sense, though it must rest on the fullest understanding of the text, is primarily a feat of English composition. It must be utterly

free, in the sense that it is not in the slightest degree bound or restricted by the verbal expression of the original. And yet we hear of free translation and literal translation. Obviously literal translation is something other than translation in the proper sense of the word. To avoid confusion I myself call it *construing*. Now translation is an extremely difficult art; but it is a valuable exercise for the cultivation of the mind, demanding, as it does, the most searching study of the original and the most effective expression in English that is attainable. There should be as much of it as time allows, at all stages. The method of it can be taught early, but it is especially appropriate to advanced students. In the nature of things, however, the amount of translation that can be done is strictly limited. It must always be done in private, with all the pains entailed by literary composition and the added pains of ascertaining to the full the thought and mood of the original. Oral translation—reading English from a Greek or Latin book—is too difficult to be attempted. However skillful some may appear to be in doing this, they would never be content with what they have offered as a translation if it were taken down in writing.

Construing, on the other hand, has its uses, though there should be as little of it as possible. It is an exercise in grammar and vocabulary, a device for helping beginners over the difficulties presented by the idiom of the Greek or Latin, a kind of temporary scaffolding to be removed as soon as possible. It "shows the construction" of the original (often outrageously demanded of a translation. It is a hasty means of communicating between teacher and pupil about moods and tenses and cases. It has little to do with the thought of the text. Clever students can often do it quite glibly and still remain unaware of what the author is actually saying. When Father Schoder speaks of overworking translation I wonder if he does not mean the more or less elegant *construing* which passes for translation.

Aside from translation, which is a legitimate but strong medicine, and *construing*, which is a bastard thing, what *is* one to do with a text in a class? There are at least two honest things to do. One is to read the text aloud; when I say "read aloud," I do not mean pronouncing the words one after another as if they were printed in a column. I mean reading with full understanding of the sense, with conscious observance of the proper phrasing, emphasis, and intonation. To be able to do this the student must first study the passage carefully, discover its full meaning, and note exactly the sense-pauses and emphases; he must then rehearse the passage aloud until he can express the thought correctly. If he can do this, the teacher need feel very little uncertainty about the adequacy of his preparation. Faulty reading quickly reveals careless study, which can be dealt with by tactful scolding, or mistakes in interpretation, which can be corrected. The teacher should

do his part and share the reading with the class, to show how it is done, and to give a fuller understanding and appreciation of the more effective or more difficult passages. There should be much re-reading by way of review, as much as time allows. There is no other way in which one can get so close to the mind of the author and spirit of his language. A student who has read a passage aloud, or heard a passage read aloud, knowing what it means, is left with the impression of a living and reasonable language, not with the impression produced by so-called translation, of a clumsy, awkward, and unlovely way of saying things. Furthermore, he has dealt with the book exactly as the writer intended it to be dealt with: every classical Greek and Latin author wrote for the ear, and unless we hear what he wrote we lose one of the great advantages which come from reading the original instead of a translation.

The other thing to do besides reading is to paraphrase and summarize the thought of the passage read, by sentence or by paragraph. This is best done with the book closed, after the passage has been read, so that the student's mind will be occupied with ideas rather than words and he will not be tempted to *construe*. This will afford an opportunity to discuss at large the movement of thought in the book. It will serve to keep the student aware that he is reading a book in which something interesting and important is being said, and to prevent him from being lost in linguistic details.

As for grammar, the indispensable foundation for understanding, there should be no more talk about it while the text is being read aloud than is necessary to correct mistakes of understanding. Grammatical principles must be taught as a separate exercise, when they can be allowed first place in importance, best in writing Greek and Latin composition. In reading, grammar should be kept a negative thing. Of course, nothing is to be said against the teacher's drawing attention to matters of grammar or vocabulary, or matters of antiquarian interest, which may be of special significance for understanding the book, and which the students might easily overlook. But on the whole the students will gain most and lose least in dealing with a piece of literature if they occupy themselves mostly with reading it and thinking about it, or, in practical terms, reading it aloud and discussing the thought.

I should like to call attention to a wise and eloquent essay on the subject in which Father Schoder and I are interested by the late Professor Isaac Flagg. This essay was first printed as part of the introduction to his edition of *Nepos* in 1895. If this book is not available, the essay may be read in *CLASSICAL WEEKLY* for April 16, 1934 (27.171-5), where it was reprinted by Professor Knapp because of "its outstanding importance as a contribution to the study and teaching of Latin."

IVAN M. LINFORTH

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA